

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

19.02.2004

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

To:

Kespat Oy
P.O. Box 601
FIN-40101 JYVÄSKYLÄ

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY
EXAMINING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 66)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year)

17-02-2004

Applicant's or agent's file reference

PCT183/470TK

REPLY DUE

within 60 days from => 17.4.04
the above date of mailing

International application No.

PCT/FI 2003/000282

International filing date (day/month/year)

14.04.2003

Priority date (day/month/year)

23.04.2002

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

H04L 9/00

Applicant

Nokia Corporation et al

1. ☐ The written opinion established by the International Searching Authority:
☐ is ☐ is not
considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority.
2. This first (first, etc.) opinion contains indications relating to the following items:
- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
 - ☐ Box No. II Priority
 - ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
 - ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
 - ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
 - ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
 - ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
 - ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application
3. The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.
- When?** See the time limit indicated above. The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension, see Rule 66.2(e).
- How?** By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.
- Also** For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4bis. For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6. For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.
- If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.
4. The final date by which the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter II of the PCT) must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 23.08.2004

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/SE

Patent- och registreringsverket

Box 5055

S-102 42 STOCKHOLM

Facsimile No. 46 8 667 72 88

Authorized officer

Rune Bengtsson /OGU

Telephone No. 46 8 782 25 00

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/FI 2003/000282

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

☒ This opinion is based on a translation from the original language into the following language english, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of:

- ☐ international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b))
☒ publication of the international application (under Rule 12.4)
☐ international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3)

2. With regard to the elements of the international application, this opinion has been established on the basis of *(replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed.")*:

☒ the international application as originally filed/furnished

☐ the description:

pages _____ as originally filed/furnished

pages _____ received by this Authority on _____

pages _____ received by this Authority on _____

☐ the claims:

pages _____ as originally filed/furnished

pages _____ as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19

pages _____ received by this Authority on _____

pages _____ received by this Authority on _____

☐ the drawings:

pages _____ as originally filed/furnished

pages _____ received by this Authority on _____

pages _____ received by this Authority on _____

☐ a sequence listing and/or any related table(s) – see Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing.

3. ☐ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

☐ the description, pages _____

☐ the claims, Nos. _____

☐ the drawings, sheets/figs _____

☐ the sequence listing (*specify*): _____

☐ any table(s) related to the sequence listing (*specify*): _____

4. ☐ This opinion has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

☐ the description, pages _____

☐ the claims, Nos. _____

☐ the drawings, sheets/figs _____

☐ the sequence listing (*specify*): _____

☐ any table(s) related to the sequence listing (*specify*): _____

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/FI 2003/000282

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Claims

Claims

Inventive step (IS)

Claims

Claims

1, 5

Industrial applicability (IA)

Claims

Claims

2. Citations and explanations:

Citation:

D1: US 6151677 A

D1 shows a programmable telecommunications security module for key encryption adaptable for tokenless use. The aim of the invention is to provide the system with a security function without the need for a physical device such as a key or a card. This function is realised by a security module.

Statement of reasons:

The claimed invention refers to a system in a digital wireless data communication network for arranging end-to-end encryption, especially for communication in audio form. In independent claims 1 and 5 a security module is arranged which is adapted for implementation with a dynamic application based on a program. This special module is not further described in claims 1 or 5, and therefore no inventive step can be observed in view of D1.